

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-34 are pending in the application. Claims 1-9, 11-25 and 27-34 stand rejected in the referenced office action. Claims 10 and 26 have been objected to. Claims 1 and 19 are independent claims. Reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested. The Examiner's objections and rejections are addressed in substantially the same order as in the referenced office action.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 USC § 102**

Claims 1-6, 8-9, 11-22, 24-25 and 27-34 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by *Prammer* (US 20040008027). Claims 1 and 19 are independent claims.

The present invention is a method and apparatus for correcting for the effects of ringing produced by excitation and refocusing pulses in NMR data acquisition in earth formations. A Nuclear Magnetic Resonance tool conveyed in a borehole in the earth formation is used for pulsing the earth formation with a first pulse sequence having a first length, and with a plurality of additional pulse sequences having a length less than the first length. An estimate of the ringing is obtained from spin echo signals resulting from the additional pulse sequences. This estimate is then used to correct spin echo signals resulting from the first pulse sequence. The corrected spin echo signals may then be processed to obtain a parameter of interest of the earth formation.

As discussed with the Examiner, the material in paragraphs [0140] – [0145] of *Prammer* (which teaches elements (a) and (b) of independent claim 1) is not what is used

10/827,183

2

in *Prammer* for estimating the ringing signal (element (c) of claim 1)

Applicant would like to draw the attention of the Examiner to the actual methodology used by *Prammer* for obtaining a ringing signal estimate. This was discussed with the Examiner on February 7, 2006.

One method used by *Prammer* to estimate the ringing signal is generally described in paragraphs [0153] – [0173]. What is described therein is a straightforward combination of PAP sequences on an echo-by-echo basis. This is done using CPMG sequences of the same length and same recovery time, and hence does not satisfy element (b) of claim 1.

A second method for ringing estimation is described in paragraphs [0174] – [0179]. The ringing is determined using a special REPS sequence that does not have the 90° tipping pulse. There is no mention in this section of recovery times, hence element (b) of claim 1 is not satisfied.

In order to sustain a rejection under 35 USC § 102, a single prior art reference must disclose each and every limitation of the claimed invention arranged as in the claim. This is clearly lacking in the present case for reasons discussed above. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and claims 2 - 18 that depend upon claim 1 are patentable under 35 USC §102 over *Prammer*.

Applicant further notes that with respect to claim 3, the additional limitations therein are not disclosed in *Prammer* as part of the method of estimating a ringing signal amplitude. The first and second method for ringing estimation in paragraphs [0153] – [0179] make no mention that the second recovery time corresponds to partial recovery of nuclear spins.

Applicant further notes that with respect to claim 4, the additional limitations therein are not disclosed in *Prammer* as part of the method of estimating a ringing signal amplitude. The first method for ringing estimation in paragraphs [0153] – [0173] uses conventional CPMG sequences while the second method for ringing estimation described in paragraphs [0174]-[[0179] uses sequence in which there is no 90° pulse (see 0177). A CBW sequence does not read on either of these two.

Applicant further submits that claims 1-18 are also patentable under 35 USC §103 over *Prammer* and the prior art of record. In order for a claimed invention to be unpatentable under 35 USC §103, all the limitations of the invention must be disclosed in the references when combined and there must be a suggestion in the references or a motivation to combine them. The first conditions is not met here with respect to the substantive limitations of claim 1 discussed above.

Claim 19 includes the substantive limitations of claim 1 discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 19 and claims 20 – 32 that depend upon claim 19 are also patentable under 35 USC §§103 over *Prammer* and the prior art of 10/827,183

record.


**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §103**

Claims 7 and 23 stand rejected under 35 USC§103 over *Prammer* in view of *Edwards* (US6452389). Applicant notes that here is no teaching or suggestion in *Edwards* of the substantive limitations of claim 1 discussed above. Accordingly, claims 7 and 23 are patentable under 35 USC § 103 over *Prammer* in view of *Edwards*.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-0429 (584-36526-US).

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 22 February 2006

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Kaushik P. Sriram, Registration No. 43,150  
Madan, Mossman & Sriram, P.C.  
2603 Augusta, Suite 700  
Houston, Texas 77057  
Telephone: (713) 266-1130  
Facsimile: (713) 266-8510